

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR

FRIDAY, THE 24TH NOVEMBER 2006 / 3RD AGRAHAYANA 1928

WP(C).No. 31149 of 2006(G)

PETITIONER:

P.VASANTHI, W/O.JAYARAJAN,
AGED 47 YEARS, PURTHEKUNDIL HOUSE,
CHIRAKKU THAZHE POST, KIZHUNNA, KANNUR-7.

BY ADV. SMT.K.K.CHANDRALEKHA
SRI.SUDHEESH THAROL

RESPONDENTS:

1. PROPRIETOR, POLY ROPES INDUSTRIES,
THAZHE CHOVA, POST CHOVVA, KANNUR-6.
2. CONTROLLING AUTHORITY UNDER PAYMENT OF
GRATUITY ACT (DISTRICT LABOUR OFFICER),
KANNUR.

R2 BY G.P. SRI.I.V.PROMOD

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 24/11/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, J.

.....
W.P.(C) No.31149 of 2006
.....

Dated this the 24th day of November, 2006.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is challenging the order issued by the second respondent declining to reopen the case for further evidence of the petitioner. On going through the documents I find all what petitioner wants to prove is a profession tax receipt issued by a Panchayat. If petitioner has produced receipt issued by a statutory authority, petitioner can argue it's admissibility before second respondent without even proving it through witness. In any case since second respondent has closed the matter for orders, the petitioner is free to challenge the final order on issues raised in this W.P. also. The W.P. is accordingly closed.

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR
Judge

pms